

REMARKS

In response to the Advisory action dated February 26, 2007 and the Final Office action dated October 2, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1 and 9 are amended, leaving Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. Particularly, support for amended Claims 1 and 9 is at least found in the specification at Page 10, lines 11-27 and Figures 2 and 3.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitagawa et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054262 (hereinafter “Kitagawa”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Amended Claims 1 and 9 recites, *inter alia*,
the image display part comprising:

a) a lower polarizing plate for polarizing light, *the lower polarizing plate including a first polarizing film and a first protecting layer laminated to the first polarizing film and protecting the first polarizing film*,

- b) a liquid crystal display panel for displaying images by using a polarized light emitted from the lower polarizing plate, and
- c) an upper polarizing plate *including a second polarizing film and a second protecting layer laminated to the second polarizing film and protecting the second polarizing film* and disposed on an upper surface of the liquid crystal display panel for polarizing light emitted from the liquid crystal display panel; and
 - a protecting part disposed on an outer surface of the image display part perceived by user's eye for protecting a surface of the image display part from an external shock or foreign matters;

wherein the upper polarizing plate comprises a glare treatment and the protecting part comprises an anti-glare treatment.

In the Final Office action at Pages 2 and 3, transparent layer 12 of Kitagawa is considered as disclosing the "protecting part" of the claimed invention. Paragraphs [0016] and [0021] of Kitagawa discloses a polarizing plate in which a protective layer is provided on a polarizing film. Referring to Figures 1 and 2, transparent protective layers 12 and 13 are disposed on upper and lower surfaces of polarizing film 11, respectively. That is, the polarizing plate of Kitagawa *includes* the protective layers 12 and 13 and the polarizing film 11 and the transparent layer 12 does not teach or suggest a "protecting part disposed on an outer surface of the image display part perceived by user's eye for protecting a surface of the image display part from an external shock or foreign matters" as claimed.

Thus, Kitagawa does not teach or suggest a lower polarizing plate including a first polarizing film and a first protecting layer laminated to the first polarizing film and protecting the first polarizing film, and an upper polarizing plate including a second polarizing film and a second protecting layer laminated to the second polarizing film and protecting the second polarizing film and a protecting part disposed on an outer surface of the image display part perceived by user's eye for protecting a surface of the image display part from an external shock or foreign matters of amended Claims 1 and 9.

Since Kitagawa fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and 9 and that there lacks evidence that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in art would lead that individual to modify Kitagawa to include the "protecting part" to teach the claimed invention, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicants' invention would not have a motivation to modify the reference, nor a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the

Application No. 10/520,262
Response dated: April 2, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action dated February 26, 2007
(Final Office Action dated: October 2, 2006)

claimed invention by the Examiner's modifying the reference. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness is unfounded. *Id.*

Thus, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding amended Claims 1 and 9 with respect to Kitagawa. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 9 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Claims 2 and 5-8 variously depend from Claim 1 are and correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the relevant §103 rejections and allowance of Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon-Copp

Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413

Date: April 2, 2007